Version with Markings to Show Changes Made

50. (Amended) An [The] apparatus of providing access to a channel of an Internet Relay Chat group to a mobile device [according to claim 39], [further] comprising:

means for placing a mobile chat proxy server in a direct communication path between a standard Internet Relay Chat server and a wireless gateway server supporting said mobile device;

wherein said mobile chat proxy server forwards chat commands from said mobile device to said standard Internet Relay Chat server and [ghosting] said channel of said Internet Relay Chat group is ghosted.

REMARKS

Claim 50 is amended herein. Claims 1-50 are pending in the application, with claims 13-19 and 32-38 withdrawn from consideration.

Allowable Claims

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claim 50 recites allowable subject matter. Claim 50 is amended herein to be in independent form. Claim 50 is now in condition for allowance.

The Applicants again thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 12 and 31 recite allowable subject matter and are now allowed.

Claims 1-5, 7, 9, 20-24, 26, 28 and 30 over Burgan

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 7, 9, 20-24, 26, 28 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Burgan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,459,892 ("Burgan"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1-5, 7, 9, 20-24, 26, 28 and 30 recite, *inter alia,* a mobile chat proxy server in a direct communication path between a standard Internet Relay Chat server and a wireless gateway server supporting a mobile device.

Burgan appears to disclose a wireless communication system that includes a system controller, a chat server and a plurality of wireless communication devices (Abstract; Fig. 1). The chat server manages the communication of a plurality of chat discussions facilitating substantially real time communication among the plurality of wireless communication devices (Burgan, Abstract). The chat server receives a chat request and in response to such receipt, sends a chat response (Burgan, col. 3, lines 65-66). The chat request is communicated to the chat server via a server interface from a system controller and the chat response is communicated via the server interface to the system controller (Burgan, col. 3, line 67-col. 4, line 3). The system controller then routes the chat response to the requesting device which may be a message input device such as a telephone, a computer, a desktop messaging unit or an individual or wireless communication device (Burgan, col. 4, lines 4-10).

Burgan discloses a system that allows chat functions between various devices, i.e., a telephone, a computer, a desktop messaging unit, a mobile cellular telephone, a mobile radio data terminal, a mobile cellular telephone having an attached data terminal, and a two way pager connected to a PSTN and a wireless communication system.

The Office Action alleges Burgan's chat server (item 48) equates to Applicants' Internet Relay Chat server (Office Action, page 3). Burgan's chat server operates between a PSTN and a wireless communication system. None of Burgan's various devices are connected to an Internet. Burgan fails to disclose chat functionality over an Internet, much less a mobile chat proxy server in a direct communication path between a standard Internet Relay Chat server and a wireless gateway server supporting a mobile device, as recited by claims 1-5, 7, 9, 20-24, 26, 28 and 30.

A benefit results from placing a mobile chat proxy server between a standard Internet Relay Chat server and a wireless gateway server, e.g., efficient transfer of data. A proxy server integrates the components within a communication path by serving as a proxy between a wireless Internet gateway and a standard IRC server. A proxy server enables a rich client application for an otherwise "incompatible" or limited capacity device (such as a wireless handset).

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1-5, 7, 9, 20-24, 26, 28 and 30 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 6, 8, 10, 25, 27 and 29 over Clark in view of Holmes

In the Office Action, claims 6, 8, 10, 25, 27 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Burgan in view of Holmes et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,178,331 ("Holmes"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 6, 8, 10, 25, 27 and 29 are dependent on claims 1 and 20 respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 20.

Claims 6, 8, 10, 25, 27 and 29 recite, *inter alia,* a mobile chat proxy server in a direct communication path between a standard Internet Relay Chat server and a wireless gateway server supporting a mobile device.

As discussed above, Burgaon fails to disclose a mobile chat proxy server in a direct communication path between a standard Internet Relay Chat server and a wireless gateway server supporting a mobile device, as claimed by claims 6, 8, 10, 25, 27 and 29.

The Office Action correctly acknowledged that Burgan fails to teach using SMPP or a short message system controller. However, the Office Action relies on Holmes to allegedly make up for the deficiencies in Burgan to arrive at the claimed invention. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Holmes appears to teach a bi-directional multiplexing messaging gateway for wireless devices (Abstract). Kernel processes within the gateway comprise short message system SMS that manages interaction with SMSC via a communications protocol (SMPP for SMS systems) (col. 3, lines 19-24).

Holmes fails to make up for the deficiencies in Burgan. Neither Burgan nor Holmes, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest a mobile chat proxy server in a direct communication path between a standard Internet Relay Chat server and a wireless gateway server supporting a mobile device, as claimed by claims 6, 8, 10, 25, 27 and 29.

A benefit of a chat proxy server is, e.g., that the chat proxy server can also be extended to other "messaging" protocols.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 6, 8, 10, 25, 27 and 29 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

31,450

William H. Bollman
Reg. No. 36,457

Manelli Denison & Selter PLLC
2000 M Street, NW
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036-3307
TEL. (202) 261-1020
FAX. (202) 887-0336

WHB/df